

the issues and voice their opinions now before the final decision on the Baby Doe issue is made.

REFERENCES

1. Kalter H, Warkany J: Congenital malformations: Etiologic factors and their role in prevention. *N Engl J Med* 1983 Feb 24; 308:424-431
2. Williams RH: Our role in the generation, modification, and termination of life. *Arch Intern Med* 1969 Aug; 124:215-237
3. Ellis TS III: Letting defective newborns die: Who decides? *Am J Law Med* 1982 Winter; 7:393-423
4. Lorber J: Results of treatment of myelomeningocele: An analysis of 524 unselected cases with special reference to possible selection for treatment. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 1971 Jun; 13:279-303
5. Duff R, Campbell AGM: Moral and ethical dilemmas in the special care nursery. *N Engl J Med* 1973 Oct 25; 289:890-894
6. Current opinions of the Judicial Council of the American Medical Association. Chicago, AMA, 1981
7. Houle v Maine Medical Center, Super Ct, Cumberland County, Maine, Dkt No. 74-145, 1974
8. Application of Cicero, 421 NYS 2d 965 (Ct App 1979)
9. Robertson JA: Involuntary euthanasia of defective newborns: A legal analysis. *Stanford Law Rev* 1975; 27:213-269
10. Brahams D: Acquittal of pediatrician charged after death of infant with Down Syndrome. *Lancet* 1981 Nov 14; 2:1101-1102
11. Taub S: Withholding treatment from defective newborns. *Law Med Health Care* 1982 Feb; 10:4-10
12. Academy wins suit against "Baby Doe" rule. *Am Acad Pediatr News Bull* 1983; 19:6
13. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary: Nondiscrimination on the basis of handicap. *Federal Register* 1983; 48 (Mar 7):9630-9632
14. American Academy of Pediatrics et al v Heckler MM. *Federal Supplement* 1983; 561 (Jun 13):395-404
15. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Secretary: Nondiscrimination on the basis of handicap relating to health care for handicapped infants. *Federal Register* 1983; 48 (Jul 5):30846-30852
16. AAP may go back to court to fight new "Baby Doe" regulation. *Pediatric News* 1983 Aug; 17:1
17. President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research: Deciding to forego life-sustaining treatment. Government Printing Office, 1983
18. 'Baby Doe' battle returns to regulatory arena. *Am Acad Pediatrics News Comm* 1983 Aug; p 2
19. Office of Technology Assessment: The costs and effectiveness of neonatal intensive care (Case Study #10). Government Printing Office, 1981
20. Glick PS, Guyer B, Burr BH, et al: Pediatric nursing homes: Implications of the Massachusetts experience for residential care of multiply handicapped children. *N Engl J Med* 1983 Sep 15; 309:640-646
21. Strain JE: The American Academy of Pediatrics comments on the 'Baby Doe II' regulations (Special Report). *N Engl J Med* 1983 Aug 18; 309:443-444
22. Fost N: Ethical issues in the treatment of critically ill newborns. *Pediatr Ann* 1981 Oct; 10:16-22
23. Watchko JF: Decision making on critically ill infants by parents: Conflict of interest or primacy of interest? *Am J Dis Child* 1983 Aug; 137:795-798
24. Robertson JA: The law of institutional review boards. *UCLA Law Rev* 1979; 20:485

Medical Practice Questions

EDITOR'S NOTE: From time to time medical practice questions from organizations with a legitimate interest in the information are referred to the Scientific Board by the Quality Care Review Commission of the California Medical Association. The opinions offered are based on training, experience and literature reviewed by specialists. These opinions are, however, informational only and should not be interpreted as directives, instructions or policy statements.

Sublingual Challenge Technique for the Diagnosis of Food Allergy

QUESTION:

Is it accepted medical practice to perform diagnostic evaluation of food allergy by the sublingual challenge technique?

OPINION:

In the opinion of the Scientific Advisory Panels on Allergy and Otolaryngology/Head and Neck Surgery, the sublingual challenge technique is unproved for the diagnosis of food allergy. There are no defined acceptable criteria for this procedure and its use has not been scientifically established.

Controlled double-blind studies have shown that the test results are not reproducible and indicate that the method is no better than tests with placebo.